

Masahiro KISONO, S.N. 10/824,145  
Page 9

Dkt. 2271/72197

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 15 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 16 and 17 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter, and new claims 18-21 have been added. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-14 and 16-21 would be pending upon entry of this Amendment, with claims 1, 7, 13 and 14 being in independent form.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Onaga (US 6,266,693) and further in view of Ohnishi et al. (US 5,655,152).

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is allowable over the cited art, for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the aspects of the present application of (a) a network terminal apparatus that receives setting information directly from another network terminal apparatus, and (b) the setting information received from said another network terminal apparatus corresponds to settings of said another network terminal apparatus, and a setting unit of the network terminal apparatus sets the network terminal apparatus in accordance with the received setting information.

Onaga, as understood by applicant, proposes an approach for controlling printer information in a network environment or system including one or more multi-function peripheral (MFP) devices that include printing, scanning and copying functionalities, wherein status information regarding the MFD devices, and setting changes for the MFD devices, are communicated from network workstations via server and host to the MFD devices, as illustrated in Figs. 4-8 of Onaga.

In the network environment or system of Onaga, server and host act as intermediaries for delivering the setting changes to each MFD device. However, the server and host themselves are

Masahiro KISONO, S.N. 10/824,145  
Page 10

Dkt. 2271/72197

NOT set according to the setting changes.

Each of steps 570 and 670 in Figs. 5 and 6, respectively, of Onaga is labeled "Host has setting change ?" However, it is clear from Onaga, column 11, lines 6-10 and 36-44, that the setting changes are changes to be made to settings of the MFP device, and are NOT changes to be made to settings of the host.

Further, while the host in turn receives the setting change information from the server, it is clear from Onaga, column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 6, that the setting change information is received by the server from a workstation and reflects changes to be made to settings of the MFP device, and do NOT represent changes to be made to settings of the server.


Moreover, Onaga, column 12, lines 18-23, teaches that the workstation should NOT communicate directly with the MFP device, but rather the setting change information from the workstation should be relayed via the server and host to the MFP device.

Accordingly, Onaga not only does NOT disclose or suggest the above-mentioned aspects of the present application, but actually *teaches away* from aspect (a) of the present application. As the United States Supreme Court recently reiterated in the KSR case, such teaching away is relevant evidence of nonobviousness and cannot be ignored.

Ohnishi, as understood by applicant, proposes a client-server printing and facsimile system, as shown in Fig. 2 (reproduced below) of Ohnishi, wherein a print or facsimile job request is transmitted by client 25 to server 21, and the server 21 processes the job request, extracts transmission data from the job request, and sends the extracted data to an appropriate one of plural output units (printer 22, printer 23, facsimile 24, etc.).

Masahiro KISONO, S.N. 10/824,145  
Page 11

Dkt. 2271/72197



Ohnishi (column 43, line 16 through column 46, line 53) proposes that the server can be configured to maintain a setting information correspondence table (as shown in Fig. 49) that registers information indicating correspondence between output unit and unit type (and optionally server assigned to service requests to the output unit), and can be configured to receive an update request from a client, in response to which the server, if appropriate, updates the correspondence table to the client. The client refers to the correspondence table to output the transmission data to the output unit.

However, the information stored in the correspondence table is not used to set the server nor the output units.

Further, Ohnishi neither involves, nor discloses or suggests communication between the client and an output unit directly.

Applicant submits that the cited art does **NOT** disclose or suggest, and even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does **NOT** render unpatentable, the above-mentioned aspects of the present application.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 14, and

Masahiro KISONO, S.N. 10/824,145  
Page 12

Dkt. 2271/72197

the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, applicant submits that the application is now allowable, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any required fees in connection with this amendment, and to credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicant  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400